Case 3:09-cv-00620-REP Document 555 CIVIL JURY TRIAL MINUTE SHEET	Filed 01/12/11 Page of PageID#E4927
United States District Court	Eastern District of Virginia - Richmond Division
CASE TITLE	CASE NO: 3:09CV00620 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT RICHARD, VA
e-Plus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.,	JUDGE: Payne
	COURT REPORTER: Diane Daffron, Peppy Peterson, OCRS
MATTER COMES ON FOR: JURY TRIAL (X) MOTIONS BEFORE TRIAL: TRIAL PROCEEDINGS: JURY: APPEARED, SWORN, EXAMINED ON VOIR DIRE () EMPANELED, SWORN TO TRY ISSUE ()	
WITNESSES EXCLUDED ON MOTION OF: PLAINTIFF(S)() DEFENDANT(S)() COURT()	
OPENING STATEMENTS MADE () OPENING WAIVED ()	
PLAINTIFF(S) ADDUCED EVIDENCE () RESTED () MOTION ()	
DEFENDANT(S) ADDUCED EVIDENCE () RESTED () MOTION ()	
REBUTTAL EVIDENCE ADDUCED () SUR-REBUTTAL EVIDENCE ADDUCED ()	
EVIDENCE CONCLUDED () ARGUMENTS OF COUNSEL HEARD ()	
JURY CHARGED BY THE COURT () ALTERNATE JUROR(S) DISCHARGED ()	
OBJECTIONS AND/OR EXCEPTIONS TO THE JURY CHARGE NOTED BY * JURY OUT: DEFENDANT() GOVERNMENT() NONE NOTED() ** JURY IN:	
INQUIRIES OF THE JURY RECEIVED; ANSWERED () ADDITIONAL CHARGE ()	
JURY RETURNED VERDICT IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF(S) () MONETARY AWARD \$	
JURY RETURNED VERDICT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT(S) ()	
JURY UNABLE TO AGREE () MISTRIAL DECLARED () JURY DISCHARGED ()	
CLERK TO ENTER JUDGMENT ON VERDICT () TRIAL EXHIBITS RETURNED TO COUNSEL ()	
CASE CONTINUED UNTIL ATM. FOR	
MOTION(S) AFTER VERDICT: See puzz altached, for Minute entry.	
Counsel for the Plaintiff(s): Scott L. Robertson, Esq. Michael G. Strapp, Esq. Craig T. Merritt, Esq. Jennifer A. Alber, Esq.	
Counsel for the Defendant(s): Daniel W. McDonald, Esq. William D. Schultz, Esq. Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esq. Kirstin L. Stoll-Debell, Esq. Redul C. Unghay, Esq.	
SET: 9:00 cm BEGAN: 9:W & NOIR DIRE: ENDED: TIME IN COURT:	
RECESSES: (20) Ihv. Wnch	

Minute Continuation Sheet: Matter came on continuation of Jury Trial Proceedings Day 6.	
Counsel addressed trial matters with the Court. Jurors appeared; all present. Plaintiff continued to	
adduce evidence. The Court ordered that lunch be provided for the jurors. Lunch recess had.	
Defendant's Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law heard; arguments had. Motion granted in	
part; denied in part (see transcript for specific ruling). Question rec'd from the jury and answered	
in Open Court, Question marked as Count Exhibit No. 3. Stipulations read to the jurors by	
counsel for the Plaintiff; Plaintiff rested. Defendant adduced evidence. Jurors sent home at 4:40	
p.m. to return tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. for further trial proceedings. Court adjourned at 5:35 p.m.	
 _ _	
	

e 3:09-cv-00620-REP Document 535 Filed 01/12/11 Page 3 of 3 Page D# 14 QUESTIONS 1) Other Charles Is there a requirement for an entity to perform due diligence and search for patents on products/ services, etc. before the entity markets and sales their product/services, etc. ? (2) Why didn't Lawson file for a patent on its 53 system? Can it be considered "prior art" if the patent has not expired? (3) - Can one contact the US Patent Office for existing patents (search)? - Who decides if a patent is valid? - Is the US Patent Office notified and their opinion sought if the validity of a patent is questioned? How many orders to compet were ignored? (re discovery, doc. production) Cf. Ex. 3